DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 950 SO 005 164

AUTHOR	Shimahara, Nobuo
TITLE	Education Beyond Socialization.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Alternative Schools; Conformity; Cultural Context; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Sociology; Individual Power; Organizational Change; Participation; Power Structure; Self Actualization; Social Action; *Social Change; *Socialization; Social Structure; Social Systems; Social Values; Student Alienation

ABSTRACT

Radical educational change cannot take place in isolation from societal change. American schools see themselves as agents of the society, charged with transmitting the values and behaviors considered central to the maintenance of society. Critics of this functional view of socialization suggest schools should be instruments of radical change. However, these critics fail to examine the structural feasibility of their proposed innovations. Implementation of any radical educational change necessitates societal structural conditions responsive to such change. Presently education is dominated by the existing power structure. If one wishes the schools to move beyond socialization for this status quo to "reflective socialization" (a blend of critical reflection about and internalization of societal values and norms), one must combine social projects aimed at societal change with educational reconstruction. Social projects are short-term collective undertakings aimed at seeking critical social knowledge and reducing the alienating conditions of society. The goal of educational reconstruction is education beyond socialization, characterized by: 1) commitment to transforming inauthentic social reality; 2) a global orientation; 3) development of students' imaginative and creative capacities; 4) loosening of society's conventional norms of behavior; 5) new patterns of participative decision making; 6) education outside of schools; and 7) self-actualization. (KW)

ED 071950

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 005 164

EDUCATION BEYOND SOCIALIZATION

Nobuo Shimahara

Socialization is commonly conceived as that process which internalizes patterns of conventional attitudes and behavior.[1] It is assumed that the uncritical sharing and internalization of customary values, motivations, and behavior patterns by each generation is a functional necessity for any on-going society. Socialization thus conceived has been widely criticized. Anthony Wallace, a cultural anthropologist, for example, labels it replication of uniformity,[2] and Gordon Allport, a social psychologist, calls it mirror-image conformity to tribalism.[3] It is evident without empirical elaboration that formal education in America functions primarily to reinforce the internalization of what the contemporary power structure of society requires.

The title of this article may puzzle some readers. For education is ordinarily understood as a particular process of socialization. How, then, is it plausible to discuss education beyond socialization? Our problem here is to discuss critically some aspects of the current process of socialization in education as they relate to the structure of the status quo, and later to formulate a framework for education beyond socialization.

---

[1]Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), see Section Three: Society as Subjective Reality.

[2]Anthony Wallace, Culture and Personality (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 123-129.

[3]Gordon Allport, Becoming (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), p. 34.

Social Functionalism

Whether recognized explicitly or not, social functionalism is the most predominant pattern of orientation which permeates the theories and practices of public education in America. Here social functionalism refers to a normative theory of social reality, not to a particular theory of explanation. The distinction between the two is important, but it is not always clear. For normative and descriptive problems are often confused and a descriptive theory is automatically given a normative status.

Schools are seen as a powerful agent of society compelling societal members to learn knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes central to the continuity of the on-going society. The process of schooling is a highly ritualized learning experience carefully designed to make the young internalize the cognitive and motivational patterns of the functional structure of society. Schooling, therefore, does not attempt to offer multiple alternatives of experience but a limited linear frame of experiential repertoire considered necessary for cultural continuity. It is a vital functional part of the social system where its social role is evaluated in terms of its effectiveness in fostering individual conformity. Social functionalism assumes that the development of individual interests and the understanding of social issues are secondary to the individual's role of internalizing the objective social world.

Emile Durkheim, the French sociologist who exerted enormous influence upon the course of modern sociology, is responsible for the development of the notion of social functionalism. He viewed education primarily in terms of the process of internalizing what he called "the social being" or

"the social facts"[4] rather than personal growth or, in his phrase, "the individual being."[5] Education, he contended, is essentially a "social function" not in the sense that John Dewey conceived it in terms of transaction between the individual and his social environment, but in the sense that the primary responsibility of education is to replicate the objective reality of society in the young. His view was succinctly stated in Education and Sociology:

> [The social being] is a system of ideas, sentiments, and practices which express in us, not our personality, but the group or different groups of which we are part; these are religious beliefs, moral beliefs, and practices, national or occupational traditions, collective opinions, of every kind. Their totality forms the social being. To constitute this being in each of us is the end of education.[6]

Social functionalism has been defended and elaborated by contemporary students of culture and society. Talcott Parsons, a prominent spokesman views education in terms of its twofold role, namely as an agency of socialization and of manpower allocation.[7] On the one hand, the school functions to internalize in its pupils commitments to the values of society and to the performance of specific adult roles within the structure of society.

---

[4] Emile Durkheim, Education and Sociology (Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 962), p. 34.

[5] Ibid., p. 124.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Talcott Parsons, "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society," in Harvard Educational Review, Reprint Series No. 1, pp. 69-90.

On the other hand, the school is committed to developing individuals' skills to perform roles and to accept responsibility to meet other people's expectations of interpersonal behavior relative to roles. As an agency of manpower allocation, it functions to distribute human resources within the role structure of society.

Yehudi Cohen, a cultural anthropologist, examines the roles of the school in terms of the boundary-maintaining mechanism of a nation state.[8] One of the internal characteristics of the evolution of a state, he suggests, is its development as a boundary-maintaining system, that is, as a unit (a state in this case) setting itself off from other units or systems. The boundary-maintaining system is a systematic attempt of a nation state to cope with external as well as internal pressures demanding the clear definition of limits. The school, Cohen contends, is designed to contribute to the maintenance of the boundary. In this connection he points out three characteristics of a firm boundary system: (1) role-transposability (societal members can assume each other's roles), (2) the inability to tolerate sustained and outspoken dissent (and the capacity to assimilate differences into a universalistic and standardized frame of boundary) and (3) the lack of differentiation of networks within the unit itself (the differentiation of component subsystems is reduced to the minimum).[9]

---

[8] Here Cohen presents an epistemic position more than a normative position. But his theory will be discussed since it is often used to justify the normative theory of social functionalism.

[9] Yehudi Cohen, "Schools and Civilizational States," in The Social Science and the Comparative Study of Educational Systems (edited by Joseph Fischer (Scranton, Pa.: International Text Company, 1970), p. 107.

The school, according to Cohen, facilitates all these characteristics, but its contribution to the second and third features is the important concern here. Education fosters ideological uniformity throughout the society, while attempting to minimize local and individual differences and hostile elements such as particularistic and anti-state ideologies and symbols. In order to achieve this task, education puts emphasis on universalizing values, criteria, and standards of performance to which societal members are expected to respond uniformly.[10] To universalize experience, personal needs and values, and behavioral norms, insists Cohen, is one of the essential features of education. To insure the proper function of this feature, education employs particular techniques such as compulsory use of universalizing symbols, standardized examinations, allocation of standardized rewards and punishments,and the like.[11] As Cohen points out, schooling is a function of a particular political structure, and must be understood as a part of the political bureaucracy of a state.[12]

Power Structure, Legitimating Structure, and Schools

Educators and laymen who are critical of the notion that the primary function of schools is to maintain the status quo of society, often pose such questions as these: Must the schools remain instruments of the existing social system or should education be used as one of the means of bringing about radical social change? Can the educational system change without a prior change in the overall social system? The nature of these questions is

---

[10] Ibid., p. 39.

[11] Ibid., pp. 19-50.

[12] Ibid., pp. 41-42.

abstract since they seek general answers rather than specific, practical ones; the latter responses require structural analysis of the relationships between school and society.

Some educational philosophers propose that education be changed into an instrument of social reform. Other proponents of drastic educational change, such as Ivan Illich and Paul Goodman, propose to de-school educational institutions so that they may more directly serve individual needs. Undoubtedly these positions represent a radical departure from social functionalism. However, they will continue to remain quixotic until they are translated into a new structural basis of society which will make their embodiment possible and which will constitute a counter-reality[13] vis-a-vis the existing structure of society. Most educational reformers, nevertheless, have failed at both theoretical and practical levels to translate their views into a new structural basis. In other words, their philosophies and proposals are often developed with little regard for their structural feasibility,[14] which is crucial if they are to become innovative forces in a society. If any radical proposal is to be implemented on an appreciable scale it must create a new structure of conditions which can lend support to it--a counterstructure to the predominant power structure of society. Schools can hardly become an agent of social innovation by themselves.

---

[13]The concept of counter-reality is discussed in Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality. P.166.

[14]Structural feasibility suggests here a situation in which a structural bases of society is present which supports such philosophies and proposals.

Leslie White, a superorganic culturologist,[15] has made the following statement:

> We think of education as an instrument with which we can transform society and mould it to our will. But education is not a force or instrument outside of society, but a process within it. It is, so to speak, a physiologic process of the social organism. Education is a means employed by society in carrying on its own activities, in striving for its own objectives. Thus, during peacetime, society educated for peace, but when the nation is at war, it educates for war. In times of peace, munitions-makers are "Merchants of Death"; in wartime, "Victory is Their Business." In peacetime, He is the Prince of Peace, but when war comes it's "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition." It is not people who control their culture through education; it is rather the other way around: education, formal and informal, is the process of bringing each new generation under the control of a system of culture.[16]

As a descriptive statement lending support to the theory of social functionalism this sketches well the relationship between schools and culture as we see it in our society. Failure of radical educational proposals is partly due to the failure to grasp this relationship, continually reinforced by present society, which can, however, be broken, if a viable counter-reality is created that will facilitate educational innovation. White goes wrong when he translates this descriptive relationship between schools and culture into a normative framework, assuming that the descriptive is the basis of the normative.[17]

---

[15] Leslie White is a noted culturologist who holds a superorganic view that culture exists sui generis independent of man. The following quotation illustrates his position: "In the man-culture system, man is the dependent, culture the independent, variable. What man thinks, feels and does is determined by his culture. And culture behaves in accordance with its own laws." From Leslie White, The Science of Culture (New York: Grove Press, 1949), pp. 343-344.

[16] Ibid., pp. 345-346.

[17] See Leslie White, The Science of Culture, Part II, Man and Culture; particularly chapters, vi, vii, xii.

In order to understand why schools function as they do--social functionalism at work--we shall look at two crucial spheres of the social structure: power structure and legitimating structure. By the publication of The Power Elite, C. Wright Mills electrified the interests of social scientists in the problems of power. Since the publication of this sociological classic in 1956, his model of power elite has been extensively debated, and has generated a wide range of studies of power in sociology and political science. Focusing attention on the historical development of the American power structure, Mills identified three current nuclei of power:

> The power to make decisions of national and international consequence is now so clearly seated in political, military, and economic institutions that other areas of society seem off to the side and, on occasion, readily subordinated to these. The scattered institutions of religion, education and family are increasingly shaped by the big three, in which history-making decisions now regularly occur. Behind this fact there is all the push and drive of a fabulous technology; for these three institutional orders have incorporated this technology and now guide it, even as it shapes and paces their development.[18]

Though Mills' model of power elite has been disputed,[19] the concentration of power in the three orders of institutions which Mills forcefully pointed out, is an undeniable fact of American social life. Herbert Marcuse's analysis of one-dimensional society reflects the convergence of major powers;[20] the notion of military-industrial complex, a widely popularized concept in the 60's, illustrates the working of the tripartite structure of power which has given rise to it.

---

[18] C. Wright Mills, Power, Politics, and People, edited by Irving Horowitz (New York: Ballantine Books, 1963), p. 27.

[19] See William Domhoff, Hoyt Ballard eds, C. Wright Mills and the Power Elite.

[20] See Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

John Kenneth Galbraith does not lend much support to Mills' contention that a very limited elite commands exclusive control of power in American society. Yet his The New Industrial State[21] is eloquent testimony to Mills' observation that power is concentrated in the three orders of political, economic, and military institutions. According to Galbraith, the technostructure which has given rise to the development of the new industrial system of mature corporations requires not a linear structure of decision making made by a few executives in power positions but a multilinear structure whereby decisions and plans are made through joint participation by various groups of experts in engineering, science, information, economics, politics, etc. Technostructure, the cog of the new industrial system, sets it off from the earlier entrepreneurial system of the 30's and 40's. The new industrial system requires qualified manpower, which depends on education provided mostly in the public sector of the economy, and, most of all, highly close alliance with the state.

The line between public and private authority, contends Galbraith, is being eliminated. What we are witnessing, therefore, is the consolidation of power of the economic and political systems into one. Galbraith says:

> Much scientific and technical innovation comes from, or is sponsored by, the state or by publicly supported universities and research institutions. The state regulates the aggregate demand for the products of the industrial system....
>
> The industrial system, in fact, is inextricably associated with the state. In notable respects the mature corporation is an arm of the state. And the state, in important matters, is an instrument of the industrial system.[22]

---

[21] John Kenneth Galbraith, The New Industrial State (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2nd Edition, 1971).

[22] Ibid., p. 298.

He further elaborates the above point later:

> The state, through military and other technical procurement, underwrites the corporation's largest capital commitments in its areas of most advanced technology.
>
> ....
>
> The state is strongly concerned with the stability of the economy. And with its expansion or growth. And with education. And with technical and scientific advance. And, most notably, with the national defense. These are the national goals; they are sufficiently trite so that one has a reassuring sense of the obvious in articulating them. All have their counterpart in the needs and goals of the technostructure.[23]

The new industrial system depends on the state for trained manpower--manpower trained by schooling. Thus from the point of view of both the state and its counterpart, the industrial system, education is largely an institution for manpower training required by the power structure of our time. This means that the kind of education offered at both the public school and higher education levels is determined by and large by the demands and needs of the power structure. Spokesmen of radical education have persistently criticized this social reality, but they have hardly generated change in it. Even when their proposals are tried at a local level for a time being, they are eventually aborted by the power structure; or perhaps the spearhead of the radical proposals is effectively truncated and gradually "contained" by it. Unfortunately educators repeat this failure since they have not come to grips with the structural context of power with which we are concerned here.

Let us now turn attention to legitimating structure. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann call legitimation "a second order objectivation of meaning" vis-a-vis "the first order of objectivation."[24] In The Social Construction

---

[23] Ibid., p. 310 and p. 311.

[24] Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality. p. 93.

of Reality, they analyze how everyday life is objectivated into a sedimented structure of society. The first order of objectivation means a structure of society. The first order of objectivation means a structure of institutionalization of behavior whereas the second order refers to a structure of meanings which legitimates the first order. In other words, the function of legitimation is to make plausible the institutionalized behavioral patterns and role structure of society.[25] Integration of society is a focal concern of legitimation. Legitimation explains and justifies the institutional order by giving normative and cognitive validity to institutions that bind the everyday life of people.[26] Berger and Luckmann state that "the problem of legitimation inevitably arises when the objectivations of the (now historic) institutional order are to be transmitted to a new generation."[27] Therefore, legitimation becomes a very crucial aspect of generational transmission, that is, socialization.

Our concern with legitimation is how the legitimating structure and process is implemented and how the meanings of the institutional system are determined. Again the understanding of this problem requires structural analysis. We must give attention to a process of socialization which includes schooling. Socialization serves as a mediating process between the person to be socialized and the institutional order of society. The latter is entrusted

---

[25] Ibid., p. 92.

[26] Ibid., p. 93.

[27] Ibid.

with the power to impose objectivated meanings such as right and wrong upon the former. When the individual internalizes these meanings successfully, we say he is socialized well. In socialization it is assumed that there is a structure of validation and justification which is to be unquestioned by the person being socialized. This structure is indeed the foundation of legitimation. It is this foundation that determines the meanings of the institutional order.

But who determines what is valid and justifiable? Who determines that a given curriculum is valid and justifiable? Who determines that a school is teaching effectively? Any elaborate answer to these questions naturally requires us to go beyond the scope of our discussion. We nevertheless suggest that the most influential source of the determinants is the existing power structure.[28] Indeed socialization functions very much to train the young to fit into this power structure, where they assume particular roles. The legitimating structure, then, justifies this training.

Here another vital function of schools, as has been suggested before, is to legitimate the society by fostering and maintaining ideological uniformity which is imparted into the minds of the young. In this regard schools are indispensable for maintenance of the boundary system of the state.

---

[28]Another very important variable, among others, which must be born in mind in discussing these problems referred to in the above paragraph, is what Robert K. Merton terms the cultural structure. But it is the social structure that contributes to a large extent to the determination of the following: (1) exposure to the cultural goal; (2) acceptance of the goal as moral mandates; (3) relative accessibility to the goal; (4) the extent of discrepancy between the accepted goal and its accessibility. (See Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1968 edition. Chapters VI and VII "Social Structure and Anomie.") In other words, the structural conditions of society largely determine these dimensions. It is in this context that I suggest that the most influential source of the determinants of the problems referred to above is the existing power structure.

In summary, the operation of schools is based on several assumptions. First, individual persons are trained to fulfill the functional requirements of society, and their values and needs are determined by a given society to which they are required to conform ideologically. Second, the primary reason for the existence of the school is twofold: to insure the successful performance of this training and to insure the ideological continuity of society. Third, educational emphasis is unambiguously on the maintenance of the status quo rather than on social innovation and personal growth.

Education Beyond Socialization

The preceding discussion has presented an analysis in which structural conditions play crucial roles. We have tried to demonstrate that the structural conditions of society are largely responsible for determining the function of schooling and the operation of power in society.

We now turn to education beyond socialization. By education beyond socialization we mean an education that breaks through the education-socialization symbiosis we have discussed. As pointed out earlier, socialization, and education as a particular process of socialization, is characterized by predominant emphasis on the internalization of the objectivated social world. In this regard Wallace's characterization of socialization as a replication of uniformity process is highly appropriate--a conformity to tribalism, again put it in Allport's phrase.

Education beyond socialization seeks reflective socialization, penetrating deeply into the life of youth, enriching them with new sensitivities and raising their self-awareness to a new historical level. Reflective socialization

is not passive internalization of the conventions; it is active inquiry into the active encounter with the world. It is a blend of cultural transmission in the form of internalization with imaginative probing into one's life and the variable possibilities of his world.[29]

Education beyond socialization seeks critical schooling. The schooling defined in the general framework of social functionalism is repressive, generating passivity toward the social world and insensitivity toward individual life and the future. Critical schooling is not solely the ground for producing trained manpower which fills roles of the existing social order. It fosters the development of critical sensitivity toward social and personal problems; it encourages debate rather than passive acquiry of knowledge and facts. It helps translate personal problems into meaningful issues which are inherent in the institutional order.

Implementation of an education beyond socialization requires two approaches: social project and educational reconstruction.

(i) Social Projects as a means for developing a counter-reality

We shall discuss social projects with particular reference to Amitai Etzioni who has made a brilliantly critical analysis of our society. In The Active Society Etzioni points out that one of the most baffling problems our society confronts at present is the problem of "inauthenticity."[30]

---

[29] See Nobuo Shimahara, "Enculturation--A Reconsideration," Current Anthropology, Vol. ii, No. 2, 1970.

[30] Amitai Etzioni, The Active Society (New York: Free Press, 1968), see Chapter 21, Alienation, Inauthenticity, and Their Reduction.

Inauthenticity has to be understood in terms of alienation--a social phenomenon which is so pervasive that discussion of any serious social problem must refer to it. Etzioni differentiates the psychological phenomenon of alienation from the sociological, which has structural bases and psychic consequences. From a sociological point of view, alienation consists in "the unresponsiveness of the world to the person, which subjects him to forces he neither comprehends nor guides."[31] In this sense it refers to objective conditions beyond people's understanding and control.[32] Alienation exhibits the absence of social responsiveness to personal needs, with no claim (or pretention or promise) that institutions are responding effectively to these needs.

Inauthenticity arises when institutional responsiveness is absent, so that a person is unable to participate authentically in the processes that shape his social being; at the same time the institutional structure claims to be responsive when it is actually unresponsive. In Etzioni's words, "A relationship, institution, or society is <u>inauthentic if it provides the appearance of responsiveness while the underlying condition is alienation</u>."[33] He states further: "Objectively, both alienating and inauthentic conditions are excluding, but inauthentic structures devote a higher ratio of their efforts than alienating ones to concealing their contours and to generating the appearance of responsiveness."[34]

---

[31] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 618.

[32] Ibid.

[33] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 619.

[34] <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 619-620.

In the earlier stages of industrial development, alienation was predominant: both the appearances and conditions were unresponsive. But in our highly complex affluent society, a fundamental problem seems to be inauthenticity rather than alienation.[35] Despite the phenomenal affluence of our society, it does not seem to be a genuinely responsive one.[36] Etzioni contends:

> ...inauthentic societies are less responsive than alienating ones in two ways: (a) There seems to be more limitations on the acquisition of valid societal knowledge and collective self-consciousness and, hence, on the mobilization of most members for political action: and (b) there seems to be a trend toward the increasing construction of the identity of the citizens around the rejection of some foreign power and the maintenance, in non-war years, of a semi-military mobilization of society which divides the members of one society from those of another.[37]

When inauthenticity pervades the social network of people's life, social costs for socialization and schooling go up, since the double standard (appearance versus actual conditions) must be maintained at very high cost. We are witnessing inauthentic socialization and schooling.

The transformation of an inauthentic society, according to Etzioni, requires both personal and collective commitments to reduce two elements of the inauthentic condition: (1) the alienating structural conditions, (2) the forces that maintain the inauthentic symbols and institutional facades.[38] He proposes social projects as a catalyst for active social mobilization and transformation. The projects are both personal and collective, and symbolic.

---

[35] Ibid., p. 646.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid., pp. 647-649.

Personal projects developed by individuals aim at increasing authentic and critical societal knowledge which will unveil the underlying structure of the symbolic and institutional facades. If these personal projects are to be socially effective at all they will have to be related to symbolic-collective (as against materialistic-collective) projects[39] which can activate individual power and commitment in a collective form. When critical social knowledge and collective power and commitment are blended, they can affect the alienating structure of power. A project is a heightened level of commitment to a particular problem for a relatively short period of time, but Etzioni suggests a series of related projects which will constitute a social movement on a macroscopic scale.

Since the projects, both personal and collective, have two aims (to acquire critical social knowledge to unveil the institutional facades and to reduce the alienating conditions of society), they will proceed in two phases: first, to sensitize those who still believe in inauthentic symbolism toward the fact of institutional facades; second, to develop collective power so as to combat the inauthentic power structure, particularly inauthentic politics. One may recall that H. G. Wells called them an open conspiracy.[40] These projects will have to mobilize people at the grass-roots to participate in the development of counter-realities vis-a-vis the inauthentic power structure. These counter-realities will be viable since they will be created democratically and will be the result of people's authentic commitment

---

[39] Etzioni contrasts symbolic-collective projects with materialistic-collective ones. The former refers to projects which seek symbolic (cultural) authenticity; the latter to projects which seek material affluence. He contends that the latter would not lead to an authentic society.

[40] See H. G. Wells, Imperialism and the Open Conspiracy (London: Faber and Faber, 1929)

guided by their critical social knowledge. These people will be distinguished from others by their counter-identity rooted in their self-awareness of, and new sensibilities to, an active society.

We wish to stress again that institutional responsiveness is the vital key to the implementation of drastic educational proposals. To project these proposals into the currently alienating institutional conditions is to doom them. The conditions of institutional responsiveness must be present for the effective practice of such proposals. We have argued that innovative educational philosophies have not sufficiently taken into consideration the indispensability of such conditions of responsiveness; this is why they have failed to come into reality. We have also contended that these conditions can be created by personal and group projects.

(ii) Educational Reconstruction

Now we turn to educational reconstruction. We shall delineate only a few fundamental principles relative to educational reconstruction.

First, education beyond socialization must be committed to transforming inauthentic social reality. This is the most audacious and far-reaching goal of educational reconstruction. Audacity of educational commitment is, however, urgently needed at a time when conditions of inauthenticity are extensively upon contemporary men and women. Programs of education beyond socialization will provide students with critical social knowledge and a sense of commitment by exposing them to various events and conditions which reveal contradictions between the appearances and the conditions of society, between claims and performance, between the ideals and reality. Critical social knowledge can provide the incentive to transcend repressive forms of life and guide students toward a new level of life and society; when this

occurs, it can be translated into authentic reality, into an outlook of humane existence. Education beyond socialization will be involved in various projects (as referred to above) which can alter inauthentic consciousness into authentic consciousness. Educational reconstruction requires formal education to be part and parcel of a social movement in which education would serve as the catalyst.

C. Wright Mills said:

> Men in masses [men overwhelmed by mass ideology and opinions lacking contact with fundamental human problems] are gripped by personal troubles, but they are not aware of their true meaning and source. Men in public confront issues, and they are aware of their terms. It is the task of the liberal institution, as of the liberally educated man, continually to translate troubles into issues and issues into the terms of their human meaning of the individual. In the absence of deep and wide political debate, schools for adults and adolescents could perhaps become hospitable frameworks for just such debate.... But educational practice has not made knowledge directly relative to the human needs of the troubled person of the twentieth century or to the social practices of the citizens.[41]

Indeed, education beyond socialization will be obligated to identify "the troubles" and translate them into meaningful issues so that men and women can come to grips with the significance of such issues to them and to their world. When education moves toward the fulfillment of this obligation, it will cease to be merely a transmissive agent and, in turn, will be infused with enthusiasm for social reconstruction. Education will become a vehicle for debate, clarification, and formulation of ideas and issues related to politics, economy, the military system, ecology, etc. Education beyond

---

[41] C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 318-319.

socialization will initiate discussion, inquiry and social analysis rather than indoctrinate ideals and ideologies. It will help students inquire into possible alternatives to the existing social order.

Second, education beyond socialization is oriented toward a global perspective. Contemporary men and women are living in a complex world of immediacy and interdependence--a world where critical problems of one people affect immediately other peoples and their social conditions. Indeed, when we deal with people in one society, we are actually dealing with one part of world humanity. This outlook of world unity should be a basis of new education. In the past provincialism, nationalism, and ethnocentrism have prevented the development of this outlook; but the complex reality of interdependence in which we live now demands that people look at themselves in a broader perspective. One of the most vital educational commitments, then, is to examine conditions and problems concerned with the establishment of a world community where mankind can appreciate its authentic unity and life. It may be recalled that Theodore Brameld has devoted more than two decades to the formulation of an educational philosophy which underlies education for a world order.[42]

Third, education beyond socialization will develop the student's capacity for otherness--the capacity to be creative and imaginative. Such capacity would enable the person to transcend the bonds of prevailing culture

---

[42]See Theodore Brameld, Patterns of Educational Philosophy: Divergence and Convergence in Culturological Perspective (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971), Part Five; Theodore Brameld, The Climactic Decades: Mandate to Education (New York: Praeger, 1970).

and to envision a quite different type of society. While cultivating this capacity for otherness, educational reconstruction will seek germinal foci of the future--authentically innovative concepts and movements. There must be openness to the new, devotion to man and to sincere search for tomorrow's design.

Fourth, education beyond socialization must loosen what Morse Peckham terms "the policing system" of society which is a set of conventional norms to which behavior is required to conform.[43] He contends that this system is a source of "cultural" stagnation; furthermore, it impedes going beyond the conventional boundaries of society. In other words, one's act or performance is rigidly bound by traditional norms and conventions.[44] Education beyond socialization will develop a new mode of generating norms which can transform the symmetry of the conventional performance-norm relation. These norms are meta-norms in the sense that they are not bound by the existing ones.[45] Meta-norms will lead to the development of diverse forms of creativity.

Fifth, co-intentional education will become part and parcel of education beyond socialization. The prevailing bureaucratic structure of educational administration will be superseded by a new pattern of decision-making and administration--a radically different system invented by people of all walks of life. Co-intentional education will involve not only professional teachers

---

[43] Morse Peckham, "Arts for the Cultivation of Radical Sensitivity," Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge. Edited by Nobuo Shimahara (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill, in press).

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

but also increasingly paraprofessional teachers, parents, and other professionals who will serve as resource persons for the students. It will develop programs involving political parties, public groups, and various movements which will vigorously debate social and political alternatives. This education, therefore, becomes a learning community. Co-intentional education is task-oriented. Educational projects will be organized around particular foci of study.

Sixth, education beyond socialization will refuse to limit the educational process to schools. Certainly co-intentional education will go beyond schooling to extend possibilities of learning. Education must extend learning opportunities to the oppressed: particularly people in the Appallachians, Indians, Chicanos, minority members in the urban slums and illiterate masses around the world. In Morris Mitchell's words: "...there should not be one, monumental, factory-like building called the school. The campus of the school should be coterminous with the world. Everything should be of concern to the school."[46]

Seventh, education beyond socialization seeks personal growth and self-actualization. From a standpoint of personal growth, a social system is in the final analysis to be judged as a means to the end of human satisfaction.[47] When it functions effectively to satisfy personal needs,

---

[46]Morris Mitchell and Bert Sobel, "Beyond Bureaucracy: The Organizational Aspects of Futuristic Education," Educational Reconstruction. Edited by Nobuo Shimahara.

[47]As Philip Slater says, "We need to develop a human-value index--a criterion that assesses the ultimate worth of an invention or a system or a product in terms of its total impact on human life, in terms of ends rather than means." In The Pursuit of Loneliness: The American Culture at the Breaking Point, p. 129.

it will be authentic. What constitutes human satisfaction is not a simple question, but answers to it are not arbitrary, and are increasingly open to examination and agreement. Abram Maslow gives concreateness to the idea of human satisfaction in terms of the characteristics of "self-actualizing people."[48] These characteristics are almost identical to those of "fully-functioning persons" described by Carl Rogers.[49] Self-actualization is the central theme of the so-called "Free School Movement" and the counter-cultural movement that have come into being in the 60's. Educational reconstruction, like these movements, will call for a new education to facilitate self-actualization.

Conclusion

Innovative educational proposals which will attempt to introduce drastic change in the existing network of social institutions, can rarely be implemented on any significant scale without a structural basis for them. Implementation of such proposals needs, therefore, the presence of a structural basis of society that is not hostile to the implementation. It requires the structural conditions that will promote social responsiveness to such proposals. It is hoped that these structural conditions can be gradually created by the collective and symbolic projects that will seek the authenticity of institutions. Therefore innovative educational proposals and the social projects must be put into practice hand in hand. Education beyond socialization can

---

[48] See Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1954).

[49] See Carl Rogers, On Becoming a Person (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961).

become a plausible proposal when there is social responsiveness to it. Educators who seek radical educational change must be encouraged, therefore, to participate in social projects.